DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 468 993 SP 041 060

AUTHOR	Braslavsky, Cecilia
TITLE	Teacher Education and the Demands of Curricular Change. 42nd Charles W. Hunt Memorial Lecture.
INSTITUTION	American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Washington, DC.
ISBN	ISBN-0-89333-189-9
PUB DATE	2002-02-24
NOTE	35p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (54th, New York, NY, February 23-26, 2002).
AVAILABLE FROM	AACTE Publications, 1307 New York Avenue, N.W., Suite 300, Washington, DC 20005-4701 (AACTE members $8.95; nonmembers $11.95). Tel: 202-293-2450; Fax: 202-457-8095; Web site: http://www.aacte.org.
PUB TYPE	Opinion Papers (120) -- Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Curriculum Development; *Educational Change; Educational Quality; Elementary Secondary Education; Faculty Development; Higher Education; *Preservice Teacher Education; *Teacher Competencies

ABSTRACT

This paper examines endogenous causes of the supposed failure of education to meet educational demands. It proposes to arrange the endogenous causes of dissatisfaction with education as a continuum between two positions. The first relates to short-term causes. The second relates to structural causes. The paper assumes that both short-term and structural causes underlie the dissatisfaction with educational quality. It proposes four hypotheses for interpreting the current situation of teachers in the educational establishments of various countries: the teacher crisis is both short-term and structural; the teacher crisis is inevitably linked to the structural crisis in modern schools and education systems; the image of today's schools is that they are identical, but in fact they vary a great deal; and institutional design of teacher education and training is mainly based on teachers' rather than learners' needs and demands. The paper discusses the reinvention of the teaching profession and reflects on the competencies of 20th-century teachers, explaining that the key to promoting reinvention lies in five competencies: citizenship, wisdom, empathy, institutionalism, and pragmatism. Finally, it presents issues for the design of professional development opportunities and looks at new trends in teacher professional development. (Contains 37 references.) (SM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

42nd Charles W. Hunt Memorial Lecture

ED 468 993

Cecilia Braslavsky
Director, International Bureau of Education, UNESCO

TEACHER EDUCATION AND THE DEMANDS OF CURRICULAR CHANGE

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D. Imig

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

AACTE
AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES FOR TEACHER EDUCATION

Cecilia Braslavsky
Director, International Bureau of Education, UNESCO

Teacher Education and the Demands of Curricular Change

AACTE
American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education

AACTE 54th Annual Meeting ■ New York City ■ February 24, 2002

The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Eduation is a national, voluntary association of colleges and universities with undergraduate or graduate programs to prepare professional educators. The Association supports programs in data gathering, equity, leadership development, networking, policy analysis, professional issues, and scholarship.

The opinions, conclusions, and recommendations expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the views or opinions of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. The AACTE does not endorse or warrant this information. The AACTE is publishing this document to stimulate discussion, study, and experimentation among educators. The reader must evaluate this information in light of the unique circumstances of any particular situation and must determine independently the applicability of this information thereto.

The opinions expressed in this paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect those of the institutions where she works. The author specially wishes to thank Dr. Silvina Gvirtz for her comments and reflections.

Copies of *Teacher Education and the Demands of Curricular Change* may be ordered from

AACTE Publications
1307 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 300
Washington, DC 20005-4701
Tel: 202/293-2450
Fax: 202/457-8095
www.aacte.org

Price: $8.95/AACTE members
$11.95/nonmembers

Copyright © 2002 by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education

All rights reserved
Printed in the United States of America
International Standard Book Number: 0-89333-189-9

Charles W. Hunt 1880-1973

With a passion for teaching and a love of people, Charles Wesley Hunt helped shape teacher education for nearly half a century. His career spanned the range of educational responsibilities—teacher; university dean; president of State Teachers College at Oneonta, New York; and volunteer in national associations for teacher education.

As secretary-treasurer first of the American Association of Teachers Colleges and subsequently of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE), which he helped create, Hunt participated directly in the changes sweeping teacher education during the mid-20th century. He worked diligently to develop AACTE as the vehicle to stimulate and effect necessary changes in the education of teachers. The tools for change were varied, but of special significance were institutional accreditation, qualitative standards for effective programs, and inclusion of all types of higher education institutions.

When the lecture series honoring him was established in 1960, Hunt observed:

> In the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, we have come from our varying stations across the nation to share our experience, to pool our strength, and to play our role in the galaxy of institutional organizations which are very important in our national culture. The gradual assembling of all [collegiate] institutions for the preparation of teachers into one working group is a movement of great significance.

AACTE is indebted to the life's work of Charles Hunt and honors him with this memorial lecture at each Annual Meeting.

The Lecturer

The 2002 Charles W. Hunt Memorial Lecturer is Cecilia Braslavsky, director of the International Bureau of Education, United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). She holds a Ph.D. from the University of Leipzig, Germany, and has engaged particularly in curriculum development and capacity building in many countries, including the Dominican Republic, Mozambique, and Bolivia.

From 1984 to 1992, Braslavsky was educational coordinator of the Latin American Social Sciences Faculty and a member of its academic council. In 1989, she was appointed as UNESCO assistant representative to the Argentine Ministry of Education. Subsequently she became coordinator of the Argentine Basic Contents Program, a new curriculum framework for the country's whole education system. In 1994, she became director-general of education, research, and innovation in the Argentine Ministry of Education.

Braslavsky has received scholarships and grants for research from various foundations, and she is a member of numerous national and international professional institutions and associations. Her book *Rehaciendo Escuelas: Hacia un Nuevo Paradignma en la Educacion Latinoamericana* (Santillana, 1999) received the Andres Bello Award for Latin American Thought as the best essay on education. Her latest book is *La Educacion Secundaria. ¿Cambio o Inmutabilidad?* (Santillana, 2001).

Introduction

All over the world, there has long been deep dissatisfaction with children's and young people's education and with the training of technical and professional staff. To state a commonplace: Everyone is aware that the reasons for this dissatisfaction are as varied as the causes of the problem.

Companies are not satisfied with the education of those who graduate from the education system, because their skills do not fit the current requirements of the labor market. Families and young people themselves are dissatisfied, because their education does not allow them to plan their lives appropriately and autonomously (Schlechty, 1990). Numerous civil associations, churches, and families are concerned because graduates' values appear not to be sufficiently consistent with a vocation for democracy and peace.

The causes of the supposed failure of education to meet educational demands are very varied. The distinction between exogenous and endogenous variables is widely known. Since this lecture does not purport to be eminently analytical or deal with the design of education policies articulated with social or public policies in general, I will focus on the endogenous causes, that is, those relating to the education system itself. This does not mean we consider the endogenous causes of the malfunctioning of the education system to be more important than the exogenous ones, but simply that a professional forum requires us to specially focus our attention on those aspects we can transform through our professional practice.

By way of simplification, I propose to arrange the endogenous causes of dissatisfaction with education as a continuum between two positions. The first one relates to causes I will call *short-term* and the second to those I will call *structural.*

The position relating to short-term causes does not question whether schools and the education system as such are appropriate institutions for guaranteeing—at least for a while—children and young people education for the 21st century, nor is it concerned with issues such as the existence of a lifelong "educational cycle." It assumes that schools and the education system should continue to exist and should focus their attention on one period in people's lives—i.e., childhood and youth—but that they should perform better.

The position relating to structural causes, on the other hand, questions whether schools and the education system are appropriate institutions to guarantee the education of children and young people for the 21st century and is concerned with issues such as the existence of a lifelong educational cycle. In principle, it supports the idea of systemati-

cally recurrent education, with various entry and exit points from the labor market (Lesourne, 1993).

This document's basic assumption is that both short-term and structural causes underlie the dissatisfaction with the quality of education provided for children and young people.

This means that education systems and schools function unsatisfactorily for people because the programs, buildings, and teaching materials are inadequate; teachers lack the appropriate skills; there is excessive bureaucracy; and a number of other factors can and should be improved—but also because the role of primary or secondary teachers is linked to the foundation model of modern schools and education systems, which is in crisis and should be replaced.

This foundation model assumed, for example, that education can be provided through identical schools in diverse contexts, and it consequently proposed training for primary and secondary teachers so they could work in line with what has been called *systemic* and *methodological simultaneity* (Narodovski, 1994). Actual experience, however, seems to show that it may be not only impossible but even undesirable to propose identical educational institutions for the education of all children, young people, and adults of the same generation, let alone of successive generations.

The new curricula that have been developed in the last 20 years have undertaken, in many different parts of the world, the task to promote a real paradigm shift in education. They have included prescriptions and/or orientations toward the formation of competencies instead of the transmission of information, taking into account being able to work with cultural and personal diversity, the promotion of school autonomy, the appeal to interdisciplinary work, the promotion of creative pedagogical practices, and the renewal of educational contents in the sense of including a broader, updated, and different concept of "contents." The orientation toward diversity replaces the orientation toward homogeneity. The orientation toward creativity replaces the old search for repetition (UNESCO/IBE, 2001).

But most of the 65 million teachers employed in today's schools have been trained to work within the foundation model. All over the world there are teaching personnel with their own interests and points of view, their own organizations and lobbying power. They have demands and interact with society, they may or may not teach what people and societies today ask of schools, but they deal with and provide an alternative for millions of children and young people who would otherwise be on the streets. Are their interests and demands consonant with the educational needs of individuals and with what societies need from education? How should teacher education react—should it respond to

postgraduate demands, or to the demands of curricular change that are usually promoted by the political authorities? In fact, teacher education has to respond to people's educational needs, and these may or may not be well defined in curricular design. In the processes of curriculum design of the last two decades, civil society and teacher organizations have tended to be consulted. This implies that the new curriculum also tends to be closer to new educational needs. Do the current approaches to teacher education also tend to be closer to these needs?

We all know that there are certain traditions in teacher education. These traditions assume the use of a certain set of resources and strategies. The question we can ask is whether the profile of the primary and secondary teachers can be improved or transformed in the framework of these traditions or whether it will be necessary to use others.

Bases for the Design of Teacher Education Programs

Based on some of the ideas set out in the introduction, I propose four hypotheses for interpreting the current situation of teachers in the educational establishments of various countries:

1. The teacher crisis is both short-term and structural.
2. The teacher crisis is inevitably linked to the structural crisis in modern schools and education systems.
3. Our image of today's schools is that they are identical, but in fact they vary a great deal.
4. Institutional design of teacher education and training is mainly based on teachers', rather than learners', needs and demands.

The Teacher Crisis Is Both Short-Term and Structural

In practically all countries, pupils subjected to different achievement tests state that they have learned only an unsatisfactory percentage of what they expected during a certain number of years of study. Although in certain spheres it is not considered "politically correct" to blame teachers for these results, it is not unknown for top-level politicians—sometimes an unwary president—to say out loud what many people think: This situation is due to the fact that primary and secondary teachers do not know how to teach, or that primary and secondary teachers do not themselves know what they are *supposed* to teach.

Primary and secondary teachers perceive this situation and make no secret of it. For example, in a survey carried out a few years ago in different contexts in Argentina, over 3 out of 10 teachers stated that if they could choose again, they would select a different profession, "because teachers get no recognition." Contrary to what common sense

might indicate with regard to poor working conditions, including inadequate salaries, when they had to decide on their commitment to teaching, such considerations were no stronger than what they felt was a marked lack of social prestige (Birgin, 1995).

In this context, the "teacher drain" is hardly surprising, particularly in the case of those teachers who have worked for a time at the secondary level of educational systems—a particularly critical one in terms of working conditions, characterized by isolation and balkanization (Hargreaves, 1982).

These teachers, who in large measure fail to educate as they are expected to, who are not recognized by society and leave the education system if they can, have a problem here and now in the classrooms and schools where they work. The schools, the education system, and, above all, the pupils also have a problem with them. There is a short-term problem, to which a solution or at least a palliative has to be found relatively quickly. Until there are radically improved ways of organizing and sustaining learning practices, it is essential that they be improved, even if only partially, through various incremental strategies.

This type of situation has been repeated for decades without an adequate solution—not, however, through any lack of policies or efforts for inservice teacher education. On the contrary, a number of different policies and initiatives have been undertaken.

In Latin America, for example, there has been a shift of primary teacher education to the higher or "tertiary" level, which includes educating teachers in training efforts, in addition to their existing basic education function, while in training colleges (Diker & Terigi, 1997); the involvement of the universities in ambitious teacher training and professional development programs, such as in the Dominican Republic (Pratz de Pérez, 1995), Bolivia (Nucinkis, 2001), and Chile (Avalos, 2001); or the transformation of the conglomerate of institutions that aim to educate, update, and train teachers into an entity more akin to a network, as has been done in Argentina (Litwin, 2001). Only some of these efforts have developed as systematic postgraduate studies.

Some of these policies and initiatives do not seem to have had the desired effect. Others seem to need more time for their full development and assessment. In any case, they involve a huge effort in terms of resources and energy by committed individuals and institutions, that is not yet backed by a reasonable investment to evaluate their performance and impact.

However, knowledge of some of the policies and initiatives for current teacher education leads to the hypothesis that the majority of policies aim to develop a professional profile that is closer to the modern school and education systems that are being questioned today than to

the still-undefined educational institutions of the knowledge society constantly in flux (Attali, 1996; UNESCO/IBE, 2001).[1] The policies are oriented more from what I will call a "short-termist" perspective, i.e., to help teachers to find better solutions to the problems they encounter daily in schools as they currently function, rather than to participate in structural change processes relating to the very core of modern schools and education systems.

In numerous university-level academic institutions, a strong critical view has developed. Empirical essays and research attempt to reveal the problems of teaching practice on the one hand and the characteristics of education policies that attempt to address alternative ways of training and organizing work in education establishments on the other. However, such essays and research rarely produce alternatives for addressing other routes for current teacher education that will really improve on the strategy of "more of the same, but better"—that is, to venture into a structural reformulation of the characteristics of the profession. To do this, we should move on to the second hypothesis.

The Teacher Crisis Is Inevitably Linked to the Structural Crisis in Modern Schools and Education Systems

At the risk of oversimplifying the social history of education, it is important to understand the original meaning of the schools and education systems for which teachers began to be trained as experts in their own right (see the conception of expert systems of Giddens, 1994).

Schools and education systems were invented to respond to the challenges of a particular historical period: between the mid-18th century and the end of the 19th century. The process of incorporating new habits and knowledge for city life and industrialization was considered to be attainable by each individual over a limited period of his life using the same contents and educational methods. Changes in the rural world and the flight of populations from the country side to urban centers made it necessary to socialize populations quickly to the artificial urban living conditions.

Societies in the process of secularization and modernization gradually developed an educational utopia making it possible to direct the actions of adults in the processes of educating younger generations. That utopia was not uniform, free of tensions, or easy to reach (Tyack & Cuban, 1995).

However, the utopia had a star institution: compulsory, free schools for everyone. Some thought that schools should be linked with a single curriculum providing everyone with the same education. Others thought there should be differentiated curricula depending on the places differ-

ent groups of people were to occupy in the labor market and in the state during their adult lives.

But in almost all variants, this utopia took for granted the creation of a teaching profession, understood in this context as the practice of standardized skills within a bureaucratic, hierarchical institutional structure (see Mintzberg, 1990).[2] Such standardized skills consisted basically of collecting knowledge constructed outside the schools and education system and transferring it—presumably with little mediation—to schools through routinized teaching practices based on the main existing mass technology, the book, and to fulfill the demands—at least in the countries influenced by the French, Spanish, and Prussian tradition—of a homogeneous curriculum.

The main mechanism envisaged for developing teaching as a profession was education in certain specific areas of knowledge and values during a period of time in specialized institutions. Although in some countries and circles consideration was given from the outset to professional development or peer interchange, ideas regarding the characteristics and pace of the production of new knowledge and its transfer to schools meant that professional development or peer interchange was associated above all with teaching methodologies and was considered in line with the logic of the teachers' demand.

Both practices—initial education in knowledge and values in specialized institutions and professional development focused on teaching methodologies—guaranteed the subsequent exercise of considerable freedom of action when applying standardized skills. Such freedom of action was, however, expected to be strictly supervised by other professional peers.

All this involved a strongly endogamous circuit. Preparation, professional development, and supervision were considered to be inter-linked activities for extending and controlling teaching skills to be exercised by individuals with identical or very similar professional profiles (although at different stages of development) relating to a curriculum containing a corpus of unvarying content knowledge to be transmitted in institutions with little variation between each other or over time.

In my opinion, this core conception of the teaching profession applied to the education of both primary and secondary teachers. The usual institutional analyses that emphasize the difference between the types of teacher training institutions have probably thrown light on a number of relevant issues, but at the same time they have blurred this idiosyncracy connected with the profession's institutional nature.

Beginning in the 21st century, the challenges for which education was required were only partially comparable to those of the contexts in

which modern schools and education systems were set up. The complexity of the education required for the 21st century make it essential to maintain certain goals in teacher education. But the key question is: Are those goals "standardized skills" or not? For what and by whom are they to be set? Do they have to be homogeneous or can they be differentiated?

The most interesting new curricula emphasize that it is necessary to educate individuals to use empirical methods, i.e., to collect information, handle it, and interpret it rationally from diverse individual subjective standpoints (Tedesco, 1995). But the new curricula do not share the conviction that the new knowledge constructed can be taken on board by children and young people just as it is produced, in a single period of their lives, giving priority to systemic and methodological simultaneity and with practically no mediation.

The knowledge boom leads us to question the selection criteria for the content to be used in schools. Can it be everything? The answer of the newest and more challenging curricula is no. Must the most up-to-date content be selected? This question is more debatable, but once the initial puzzlement subsides, the most consistent response is also no. Apparently the most useful should be chosen. But the most useful for what? Here again, the reply varies. In my opinion, the most useful for understanding and transforming reality, that is, to have appropriate competencies for acting as productive, creative, analytical, and critical citizens for the 21st century. The professional teaching model invented in the middle of the 18th century and barely changed by the New School movement in this century does not include full and adequate education to make such a selection.

Likewise, it is questioned whether the substantive and organizational knowledge primary and secondary teachers acquire during their first period of education can be valid as standardized knowledge throughout the whole of their teaching career.

The proliferation of areas for the creation of knowledge outside academic and training institutions also leads us to question the fact that current teacher education and supervision is run by professionals with the same educational profile and exclusively in, or based on, educational institutions.

It has already been pointed out that at the dawn of the modern age, schools received—particularly in the Franco-Prussian traditions—clear mandates regarding the social functions to educate: for work, for social cohesion and mobility, and to construct nationality and the modern state.

At the end of the 20th century, all of this was questioned. It was forecast that there would not be sufficient work for everyone—at least

on a world scale (see, for instance, Rifkin, 1996, and Beck, 2000)—and that furthermore, whatever there is will change very quickly. There is recent evidence of great social fragmentation and economic gaps (United Nations Development Program, 2000) and the inadequacy of education to guarantee the upward social mobility people apparently desire. In schools we see the simultaneous appearance of phenomena associated with globalization and claims for identity by groups and individuals, which seem to be far from that search for a national imagery shared by all children and young people attending institutions in the same education system.

All this leaves many primary and secondary teachers feeling stranded. Only those with different capacities from those "standardized skills" historically demanded of them have been able to find a way forward, which will probably also lead to the reconstruction of schools themselves as educational institutions.

Furthermore, all this is happening under the conception that people can "buy another drill." Anticipating a most general remark on modern institutions (see Rifkin, 1996), Perelman (1992) noted that when people go to the hardware store to buy a drill, what they really want is not to buy a drill but to make a hole. Faced with all the changes I described, it seems that although people need and want education, they are not entirely sure that schools are the institutions that can best help them to acquire it. This feeling affects the primary and secondary teachers who are part of the old kind of school, perhaps focused on the "drill" and not the "hole."

School Is Homogeneous in the Abstract, but Actual Institutions Are Unquestionably Diverse

As if all that were not enough, recent educational sociology makes it quite clear that in fact, although there is a tendency to emphasize the factors common to all schools, in reality there are many kinds of schools and many ways of classifying them. One classification connects the capacity of institutions to take care of educating all aspects of a student's personality (see Tedesco, 1995). This classification distinguishes between "total" and "partial" schools.

"Total" schools are those that aspire to a complete education for young people. They transmit what they consider to be important knowledge, but they are also concerned with values. They are interested in artistic expression and physical education as well. They are attuned to the beliefs of their communities which delegate almost all educational authority to them. They usually devote 8 hours a day to scheduled activities. They have little to take from outside, since their pupils have practically no time to make use of other educational spheres and experiences.

Others are "partial" schools, specializing in some priority function. Although their discourse may have to do with integrated education, in practice they dissociate and rank. They tend to have only 4 or 5 hours a day with each group, sometimes less.

If their pupils are from the middle or upper classes, they usually specialize in the transfer of certain knowledge. This limitation can be a shortcoming, but pupils' parents can compensate for the school's failings with private language classes, arts workshops, traveling, or other activities.

But if the pupils in the partial schools are from the lower economic classes or marginalized social groups, the pressure of marginalization, their families' priorities, and their own images mean that teachers are usually orientated to teaching only basic behavior for everyday life. They take on a social function for which they have not always developed the relevant "standardized skills." This is indeed a serious problem.

A few years ago, the only possible response to the situation of these partial schools would have been a substantial increase in the number of class hours within a conventional format: more subjects, all organized in the same way in identical classrooms. Today other responses can be sought.

Two propositions are the "virtual" school and the home school. The virtual school consist of the generation of information "sites" through which information is received and skills developed. It is a school with no walls, no fixed site, no social interchange, and different kinds of professional roles that replace teachers and are constantly mediated by computer screens. The home school is undifferentiated from the family. Parents are at the same time teachers. Socialization is in both cases underestimated.

If there really is a need for community between generational peers and between individuals from different generations from outside their families as an essential aspect of the educational process, schools as areas for socialization outside the family should continue to exist, even if their format is very different from the current ones. Based on this conviction, the proposition should be that, in fact, the existence of new technologies is a unique opportunity rather than a threat.

The existence and acceptance of these technologies can facilitate a solid alliance between schools, TV, and the information highway. It may enable an association between schools biased towards welfare and an impoverishing socialization, and virtual schools functioning in the same physical space or in other community areas. Such an association could provide these partial schools with the opportunity to deal with other aspects of children's and young people's education and furthermore to do so better and intermittently, supporting entries and exits to

and from educational processes that current organizational patterns are unable to contain.

Teachers in "integrating schools"—with wide use of the new technologies—could load part of the information they provide onto computers. Their teachers could be enriched by constructing interactive means of learning alongside the young people and use part of the time available for activities where they are irreplaceable, exercising and improving what of all of them possess: their human condition and their impulse for knowledge and empathy.

The Institutional Design of Teacher Education Is Based Mainly on Teachers' Rather Than Learners' Needs and Demands

In our discourse, we educationalists are totally resistant to market logic and the establishment of educational priorities based on the logic of demand—except when we ourselves make the demands. In fact, probably one of the most widespread characteristics of teacher training is that it is organized according to priorities set by other teachers or by the state, but practically never priorities laid down by the learners in schools and education systems.

This hypothesis refers not only to whether there are opportunities for teacher training or not but also to the content of the opportunities provided. It is generally obvious that teachers demand and obtain far more training opportunities relating to teaching methodologies and strategies than to updating disciplinary content which would enable them to better understand scientific and technological progress and social change, or the changes in the characteristics of young people and adolescents themselves and what they produce.

Only recently and very slowly are teachers starting to demand educational opportunities so they can assess and use technologies that will complement books. For example, it is difficult and therefore unusual for teachers to generate strategies to use the many informative television programs, particularly science programs, as educational opportunities.

It would appear that teachers are more concerned with improving their classroom strategies and dealing with pupils' short-term needs for care and attention than with the structural needs to respond to turn-of-the-century changes. Undoubtedly, underlying this issue is an inability to interpret the reasons for violence, dropping out, and repeating grades. These are widely blamed on the context and rarely—although increasingly so—linked to a crisis in schools' institutional model.

Taking these issues into account involves rethinking the whole issue of professional development on the basis of one question: What purpose does teacher education serve? In short, why organize inservice teacher education?

The Reinvention of the Teaching Profession: A Turn-of-the-Century Challenge

At the turn of the 21st century, most governments proposed the professionalization of teaching as a goal for improving the quality, performance, and efficiency of education systems.

However, here I will suggest that such a perspective is not enough of a guide for revising current teacher education.

The demand for the professionalization of teachers is undoubtedly due to the awareness of a process of deprofessionalization. Indeed, to sustain a professional structure on the same terms as when teaching first became a profession, there are certain indispensable conditions (Perrenoud, 1996; Goodson, 2000). First of all, undergraduate education must be of high quality; second, professional development must be held at reasonable intervals or even be ongoing and also of high quality; third, there should be adequate supervision of teachers; and last, at least part of the professional corps should be involved in what could be called mediation mechanisms between knowledge and school knowledge.

Even though there is not enough empirical research, the hypothesis can be forwarded that none of these four conditions has persisted over time, either in Latin America or in other regions of the world. Although some teacher education institutions have preserved a certain level of quality in basic education, others have never enjoyed such quality or have failed to maintain it. Professional development opportunities have been very much weakened in countries with authoritarian governments: supervision in these programs either never existed, disintegrated, or became a gerontic mechanism of corporate control. Finally, curriculum design, the preparation of textbooks, and the technical advice required to produce a minimum linkage with the changes in knowledge and institutional organization have remained in the hands of other professionals and not those of primary and secondary teachers themselves (Attali, 1996; Sacristan, 1997).

Consequently, teachers no longer have available the skills for interacting with other professionals who provide the information they are obliged to use because, among other reasons, teachers are not in a

position to create alternative information (see a similar argument in Apple, 1983).

The need to take on a heavy load of administrative work, stick to outdated programs and curricula, and use textbooks written by others, is part of the deprofessionalization process. The standardized old skills, even when well learned, have lost their effectiveness.

But in my opinion, the demand for professionalization is inadequate for this situation. It could lead to the belief that what is needed is to guarantee the better acquisition of those 18th-century standardized skills for dealing with the needs and demands submitted to schools in the profession's early years and which, even if they had been mastered by all teachers in service, would be inappropriate today. The issue goes much further than that. It is a question of constructing a new field of professions (in plural) that has been given new meaning, revisited, rethought, and reconceived. This is the fundamental change that will make it possible to deal with the structural challenges facing teachers (in plural not only because they are many, but because they have differentiated profiles), of which we are often not yet aware in all parts of the education sector.

The reinvention of the teaching profession can only be achieved by restoring seeds of the profession as conceived in the early years of modern schools and education systems; but avoiding the effects of deprofessionalization and its shortcomings in order to guarantee the kind of education required for the 21st century. This cannot be done by courses or peer interchange activities, but rather requires an arduous, systematic medium-term process that will include periods for evaluating and even reconstructing some standardized classroom teaching skills and for the exchange of experience and practice-based learning—but within a framework that will allow a profound review and resignification based on many different disciplines. It is precisely this specific approach that systematic postgraduate studies should adopt as a method of professional development.

Reflections on the Competencies of 20th-Century Teachers

Reinventing the teaching profession requires a degree of clarity so as to reflect on the direction to be taken. In general, one of the problems of the teacher education courses currently offered is that they provide more of the same, almost always presented in the same way as in the past. This means that they regularly propose to update teaching methods using

traditional chalk and blackboard methodologies, in face-to-face classes. Furthermore, that is what teachers often want and expect, but also what eventually discourages and bores them.

Teachers do what they know how to do because that is what they learned when they were pupils in school and when they went through their teacher education programs. In fact, what is needed is a thorough consideration of the desired teacher profile and how to achieve it.

I suggest that the key to promoting the reinvention of the teaching profession lies in finding a focus for educational efforts. At the same time, it is necessary to guarantee certain competencies (rather than skills) for a better performance in the short term and greater participation in the reinvention of schools and education systems. This means the recreation of meanings both for teachers and for the children in society. It is through this recreation of meanings that keys to structural solutions will be found.

I consider that the key lies in education in five competencies: citizenship, wisdom, empathy, institutionalism, and pragmatism.

Citizenship

It seems essential for teachers to be able to understand and intervene as productive citizens in the world they live in, now and in the future. The endogenous culture in schools and teacher training colleges has led to constant mutual interaction between these institutions but not to a strong interaction with other institutions or areas, nor to self-questioning or a search for alternative responses beyond the confines of their immediate sphere of action. Even criticism is repeated from decade to decade without taking into sufficient consideration the changes in the outside world.

This closed circuit has prevented teachers from keeping up with the pace of change in the world. But no one without an understanding of the world can really guide children and young people and foster learning for the 21st century. This means that a basic challenge for teacher training is to broaden the cultural horizon of teachers. Consequently, all teacher education opportunities should envisage several periods of time and diverse areas for reestablishing and redefining open-minded attitudes to the world by using a wide variety of sources: literature, cinema, visits to museums, excursions to different geographical contexts, visits to scientific institutions, and short internships in factories and hospitals, among other alternatives.

One of the many examples of citizenship building in teacher education is the promotion of short internships in private enterprises or public services other than educational ones. I remember such a program to

promote this type of internship in the principal teacher training institution in Argentina. The college professors were incredibly enthusiastic, because at the age of 40 or 50 they had their first opportunity to become involved in private enterprise and to know more about production in branches related to their disciplines. Biology faculty interned in the pharmaceutical industry; physics professors were involved in engineering enterprises; social science teacher trainers worked with applied research teams connected with new settlements. They were amazed to see the connections between the discipline they taught to future teachers and "the real world."

The bias of this competency will naturally vary depending on the teacher profile in question. It is always possible to have the real world as a point of reference, but the kind of understanding and intervention sought will be different depending on the particular level and area this competency is exercised in: the social, natural, artificial, or symbolic world. Whatever the case, when considering specifications for this competency, it is not advisable to reproduce the traditional division into disciplines used in academic spheres.

Wisdom

One of the most frequent demands posed to teachers in the past was to possess the right answers. They had to show—even if it was actually not true—that they held the potential to "know everything about everything." This demand was linked to traditional pedagogy and was one of the main pillars of rote learning. From the pedagogical point of view, it promoted a contradictory effect. On the one hand, it allowed a broad first approach to some aspects of instrumental knowledge through public schools and national school systems, but on the other hand, it promoted not only stagnation in the way of teaching, but even a diminution of respect for Socratic learning practices usually developed at faculties of arts, and in the preparatory schools for middle and higher classes, before the emergence of the modern education system.

Socratic teaching and learning enabled young people to build arguments and develop rational thinking. In that framework, young people were encouraged to pose and to ask questions and to analyze different points of view. In contrast, learning by rote promotes the acceptance of a unique point of view and may be behind many of the negative phenomena of the first decade of the 20th century such as totalitarianism, racism, etc.

Does it mean that we have to advocate a return to Socratic teaching and learning, only now for everyone and not just for the elite class? In some ways, yes; what seems to be needed in a very controversial age full of

uncertainties and a lack of satisfactory answers is to be able to construct better questions and to search for new answers. In the curriculum of one country in the South, it is stated that the need is "to go from information into wisdom," using the word *wisdom* in the sense of being able to ask the right questions so as to find new answers. But are teachers really in a situation to contribute to the development of this kind of curriculum?

Research on teachers seems to show that as a result of the old, prescribed, unified, standardized ways of teaching, they are often afraid of being challenged by open questions and frequently also afraid of revealing a lack of answers. The key question is how to encourage the capacity for questioning and the ability to accept the lack of answers as an opportunity to find new, unknown, and better questions and answers.

A good example of wisdom, as it is understood in the curriculum mentioned above, is the case of a school in a very isolated village close to Dakar, Senegal. The principal and the teachers did not have computer skills, but rather than excluding computer literacy from the curriculum, the school team created a peer learning process allowing students who were computer literate to teach those who were not.

Participation in open debates with high-level, qualified representatives of other professions, organized with the contribution of professional moderators; familiarity with the role of mistakes and controversy in the history of science; as well as knowledge of biographies of outstanding social leaders that show their doubts and hesitations when facing big challenges could be of great importance.

Empathy

It is absolutely essential for teachers to learn to understand and feel for others. The "other" may be a pupil, a father, a mother, a secondary school student, a supervisor, or a government official; but it also could be whole communities: business leaders, social organizations, churches, and political parties (Hargreaves, 2000).

Empathy involves getting to know and understand the culture of children and young people, the characteristics of communities, the way society works, and its relationship with the state. It demands exercising tolerance toward, and cooperation with, different people.

It is essentially a question of being able to learn and to teach how to discover that there are other people who speak, feel, think, and do things in different ways, but who, nonetheless, have the same concern for, and right to, peace, well-being, justice, and beauty.

I wonder if teachers who, for instance, have Bolivian children in their classroom know that in the Aymara culture the future is considered to be behind and not in front of the human being. Human beings might

know how the past was and be able to look at it, but Aymara culture teaches that there is no way of knowing anything about the future because one cannot see it. How many teachers know that in Japan and in many other cultures children have to keep silent and not talk to an adult unless they are personally requested to do so, and the consequences of this in day-to-day school life? Are Western teachers aware that Islamic institutions frequently fulfill the role that the welfare state plays in Europe, providing health, education, and social cohesion; do these teachers know the difference between religion and tradition in the Arab states?

Empathy is a matter of learning and being able to teach that the others are not stereotypes of perfect or perverse people. Those others are heterogeneous, are in permanent interaction with others, and are part of cultures that have humanistic values and weaknesses.

How does one contribute to a teacher's professionalization so as to be able to help him or her find in others the elements of himself or herself? How does one prepare and reanimate the teacher's capacity to contribute to the creation of a "multiple we" that respects diversity?

In order to develop this competency, different strategies are also being used: practical or theoretical research, reading and critical analysis of books, and the unrestricted use of films from varied sources and on a variety of issues. Also producing, administering, and analyzing surveys for a better knowledge of various subjective and objective realities, to be able, to some extent, to understand different perspectives.

Institutionalism

One of the major risks of some of the new trends in the age of the new technologies is the death of public life due to the inherent weaknesses of all institutions, including schools (Dubet & Martucelli, 2000). This will not necessarily be a natural process. It will be influenced by high-level and everyday decisions of many social stakeholders. From my point of view, such weaknesses within institutions are not desirable, as they can lead to a prolonged downturn in economic, social, and political development. Institutions are places were people meet, think, and work together. If the institutions get weaker, people will have fewer opportunities to learn to live together, which is certainly not good for society.

That is the reason why I suggest that teachers must have the will and the competence to construct and maintain institutions and to articulate the macro politics of the education system as a whole with the micro politics of what has to be programed, done, and evaluated in the institutions they work in, and of the work they have to undertake in their more specific areas: classrooms, playgrounds, workshops, as well as activities off the school premises.

It seems essential for teachers to know that what is decided in the government has—or should have—a lot to do with what goes on in schools and classrooms, but that nevertheless, it does not fully determine what happens there. And, furthermore, that what happens in institutions and classrooms is really important for the present and for the future of everyone, including teachers.

There are numerous processes and events in institutions and classrooms that are determined with a significant degree of autonomy. The search for broadening the limits of autonomy, actually attempting to do so, and finding the limits of creativity can encourage the exercise of responsible criticism of public policies rather than insults and abuse. Demands can thus be made from a position of action rather than inaction.

Understanding the articulation between the system's macro politics, the school's micro politics, and the classroom may enable the whole education sector to break the vicious circles of mutual demands, from governments to teachers and from teachers to governments, thus establishing a productive tension between self-assertion and self-discipline and demands on the other actors in the complex education process at all its specific levels.

Various strategies can be used to develop this competency, such as case studies, following up on policies, preparing status reports, and the comparative analysis of trends on the basis of statistics and comparative studies.

Pragmatism

But it is, of course, also indispensable for teachers to possess criteria for selecting from a number of well-known strategies for intervening intentionally to foster pupils' learning, and for inventing other strategies when those available are inadequate or irrelevant.

It is currently said that a teacher should facilitate learning rather than present data or impose arguments. By and large, this is correct. But sometimes it is interpreted as an invitation to nonintervention, to laissez-faire with no guidance. In fact, it is arguably more difficult to facilitate than to expose or impose knowledge (Meirieu, 2000). However, without guidance, pupils (particularly pupils from the lower classes) are less likely to learn. Teachers should, therefore, know how to select, evaluate, improve, and create or recreate strategies for effective intervention. These strategies no longer consist merely of exposition. There is far more involved.

Some of these strategies include the new technologies and may include appealing to and obtaining the commitment of young people who know how to use them as effective triggers to sequences of activities

involving multiple resources. Some pupils may know more about certain things than some teachers. But teachers are adults who must be able to accept that reality without feeling inferior or constrained, so everyone can learn more, including teachers.

Various strategies can be used to develop this competency, such as peer learning through team work, mutual observation, or the development of experimental projects for applying varied strategies with control or comparative groups.

Summary

Perhaps the five competencies proposed here have not been as well defined as they could be. But I have no doubt that they must be pursued. The old proposition of standardized skills was clear, simple, easy to communicate, understandable. That is why it was a lever for action. The same occurred with the New School movement. Spiritualism, positivism, and the critical theories of the '60s and '70s had a broad impact because of their clarity and simplicity, because they were in tune with the imagery of important groups of intellectuals, politicians, and university students. Complex critical farragoes lacking a clear focus, elaborate technical proposals with no appeal to emotion, but simply based on reflexive interpretations—these will probably dazzle or attract, but they are not likely to have a real and lasting impact on changing teacher training from within institutions and with the commitment of each individual.

Some Issues for the Design of Professional Development Opportunities

The reinvention of the teaching profession is no easy task. There is, however, a significant comparative advantage: We teachers are convinced we have to change. But we are afraid—not so much of changing, but of being excluded. Therefore, the first thing we need to be sure of is that we will continue to be present. But nobody is going to give to the teachers this presence as a free gift. The profession still lacks sufficiently significant critical inputs to be able to undertake this change and we—teachers in a large sense—are usually paralysed by the traditions of our trade. In the case of kindergarten and primary or basic-level teachers, these traditions are usually "activist," inherited from the New School movement. In the case of secondary school teachers, they are usually scientific traditions that are not always up-to-date, belonging to earlier periods of the disciplines the teachers were trained in. They receive prescriptions from the

authorities and reflections by foreign authors of whose traditions they have no knowledge.

The problems of teacher education as a variable closely linked to quality and equity in education systems have been observed worldwide since the '80s. The demand for greater teacher autonomy and a change from a vocational to a professional concept of the teacher is by now, in the new millennium, a classic one. The studies by Hargreaves (1994) and Popkewitz et al. (1992) introduce us to these issues from the Anglo-Saxon literature. The studies by Gimeno Sacristan (1997) and Pérez Gómez (1987) are already classics on this topic in Spain. In other European countries (Paqueay, Altet, Charlier, & Perrenoud, 2000; Tardif & Lessard, 2000), Latin America, Africa, and Asia (National Council for Teacher Education, 1998), the literature is no less important, and along with the above-mentioned studies, these authors indicated that changes in schools had to be accompanied by processes of reform, conversion, and change on the part of the teaching staff. Teachers can be a decisive catalyst or inhibitor in any school transformation process.

The '90s found governments all over the world committed to having their teachers "improve," "convert," or "update" depending on the different views of the problem. Standardizing teachers' skills for a new school, that is, inculcating new knowledge that is useful for 21st-century schools, seemed to the reforming spirits to be no minor issue. Therefore, the state, via training schools, universities, different types of networks, but also unions and other institutions in society, began to provide different types of courses for teaching staff.

The most marked and widespread feature of teacher education in this period seems to be the parallel proliferation, even in the same region, of different agencies and ways of approaching teacher recertification. This is related to the different teacher training curricula, which in many cases lead to different curricula, and maybe this has been a necessary step towards finding the most efficient of these diverse approaches.

Let me analyze this issue for a moment. Teachers (both primary and secondary) who have graduated from the university can undertake courses in any institution and can even undertake more systematic postgraduate studies such as various master's courses or doctorates. These have the advantage of being highly formalized, structured postgraduate courses. At the same time they have the disadvantage of not specializing in teachers as teachers. These teachers will predictably not stay long in the system due to their type of specialization.

In contrast, those teachers trained in nonuniversity institutions have more limited possibilities. Refresher courses outside master's courses and doctorates lack their level of formalization and structure. In not a few cases, professional development consists of a single course

of variable length, and recertification simply consists of the accumulation of the most diverse kinds of courses, specifically intended to keep teachers in the system.

Neither of these proposals seems to be the most effective for addressing professional development, which on the one hand should be more formal and systematic and on the other, should work on the basis of knowledge that will be useful for schoolwork.

New Trends: Toward Renewed Professional Development

It is obvious that for teachers to be able to respond better both to the short-term and structural needs of their profession, a wide variety of professional development opportunities are required.

I do not believe that proposing a taxonomy of the opportunities required and a neat catalog of all the appropriate possibilities for developing each one would be fruitful. However, I cannot fail to mention some of them.

First of all, there must continue to be alternatives for substantive updating training that will keep teachers in touch with the changes in the world and in scientific and practical knowledge. To achieve this, it is vital for such training to make much greater use of the production of scientific information and debate in the mass media.

Second, there must continue to be alternatives for reviewing methodological and institutional practices. Some research findings seem to show that the most important access to such information can be through TV. A priority should be given to producing videos showing renewed practices and promoting reflection on them.

Third, it is increasingly necessary to develop opportunities for other professionals to take up the teaching profession. In many countries, there have always been professionals untrained in teaching who for various reasons decide to work in schools. In some countries, the employment crisis is leading engineers, medical doctors, and others to offer their services in educational establishments. In some cases, this situation may provide an unprecedented opportunity for enriching and broadening the horizons of educational institutions, particularly for those providing technical professional education—but always as long as these "other professionals" are not submerged by those aspects of institutional cultures that require transformation and receive the kind of training that will enable them to display their differential strengths and skills for the benefit of reinventing schools, systems, and the teaching profession.

Fourth, there must continue to be opportunities for master's courses and doctorates that are intended to train for functions other than teaching, but in service of teaching. These opportunities should be

evaluated on their relevance for training "producers" of mediation mechanisms between the real world and teaching, i.e., on the achievements of the participants in terms of the generation of new systematic knowledge about educational reality or of original developments for use in schools, such as textbooks, educational videos, databases, multimedia tools, or proposals for alternative work processes for students or teachers such as apprenticeships for students in companies, community service projects, or teacher placements in different educational establishments.

But just as the strength of the first two possibilities is their emphasis on the need to resolve everyday situations, their weakness is that the short time over which they are usually employed makes it impossible to work in depth on a review of the profession and on giving it new meaning in the light of the changes in societies, articulating it with the changes required in schools and education systems. Just as the strength of the fourth possibility should be the provision of new inputs for improving the quality and equity of education processes, its weakness is that teachers in many countries usually approach this type of postgraduate course with the prospect of giving up their teaching role and entering other areas in the education sector: publishing, research institutes, universities, or—if they remain within educational establishments—in management functions.

I therefore believe it is essential to give support to a fifth type of postgraduate education, which is still in the early stages of development. This is systematic, medium-length programs, conceived as processes of research-action-training for the improvement and transformation of teachers in their direct, daily contact with students.

The requirements these programs should have can be inferred directly and indirectly from the foregoing. In my opinion, these are connected with six issues: the purposes and objectives of the training, the organizational structure and purpose, the participants, the training team, the design itself, and assessment.

With regard to the purposes and objectives of the training, and at risk of repeating myself, any systematic postgraduate course for teachers with the purpose of retaining them in the system for several decades should deal at the same time with training in the five competencies proposed above, or others that future debate may prove to be more relevant.

With regard to the organizational structure, this type of professional development has to be conceived as an undertaking shared between many institutions, headed by a university. The universities have a tradition and an image that places them in the position of producers of knowledge. However, more recently, other entities are rapidly producing knowledge. There are cases of companies, govern-

ments, and nongovernmental organizations that also generate knowledge, even more quickly than some universities. These other institutions usually generate another kind of knowledge than universities, which is sometimes very closely connected with transforming reality. It would therefore seem fruitful that these institutions, which in many cases also have a solid experience in professional training, enrich and complement the universities in these undertakings.

It is essential for these postgraduate courses to be in line with the needs of the system's users and of those who subsequently employ the graduates. In principle, it would not be desirable to start teachers' postgraduate courses without holding workshops with teachers and students, carrying out surveys with business leaders, or adopting other strategies to get a clearer idea both of the requirements of the learning needs as interpreted by society at large and of those needs the pupils currently in the system and their families feel are also their own.

With regard to the participants, it would be highly desirable to set up teams of teachers working in the same educational establishment in order to make it easier to support institutions, envisaging work with a multidisciplinary cohort of colleagues working at different levels of the educational system. This could contribute substantially to work on issues such as the disarticulation of levels within the education system and the balkanization between areas and disciplines.

The training team should be complex and multidisciplinary, with some members from within the organizing institution and others belonging to associated institutions, with foreign experts invited in all cases, since they bring complementary knowledge and experiences. The team and should have the bulk of the actual participants in the course as an integral part of it. Inservice teachers usually have a number of skills that are not exploited in many of the current training scenarios. They are treated as a tabula rasa, which is how they subsequently treat their pupils. This team should also be open and convene users and subsequent employers of graduates. It is desirable for teachers trying to reinvent their profession to have a more relaxed schedule, different from their usual hectic one, so they can listen calmly to each other and learn from them. It is essential for part of this training team to be devoted full-time to the program, but also that another part should not be. This will guarantee a balanced combination of intensive attention to teachers in training and a break with the traditional endogamy of the system.

The design of these programs should guarantee a professional development program that will deal at the same time with short-term needs and with reinventing the profession. It is a question of constant association between training for action and for critical reflection on the

action. This approach cannot be guaranteed by rapid transfer, with no period of analysis, reflection, and personal inner readjustment by each participant. But neither the teachers nor those who fund these undertakings have lengthy periods of time available.

I consequently believe that, in principle, these postgraduate studies should extend over 1 academic year. This would also facilitate the development of research-action activities relating to participants' own practice or that of their colleagues. At the same time, these programs should include periods of interaction for the whole cohort in more traditional areas, other periods working in the institutions they belong to, which the participants should not leave completely during the postgraduate course, and others for individual work.

The periods for interaction of the whole cohort should consist of a minimum of 120 hours of personal interaction among the members of each cohort and a maximum of 360. In my opinion, these should never exceed three weekly sessions of 3 hours each. These teaching hours could be organized in different ways. In cases where teachers come from different regions of the country, away from the place where the activity is organized, there could even be a single intensive monthly meeting. An excessive number of hours for activities requiring collective attendance runs the risk of these activities not being sufficiently intensive and of people feeling they are wasting their time, and for the postgraduate course as a whole to have a strong tendency toward the "consumption" of traditional classes, and not for the construction of individual learning. The time spent working in the educational institutions participants belong to could also have a minimum of another 120 hours' work, which may be used in very different ways, but always within the framework of a research-action project, prepared above all as a learning experience transferable in the form of new, everyday working habits in the context of the reinvention of the profession.

The time working in out-of-school areas, such as the university's own laboratories, company laboratories, hospitals, or other specially selected spheres, could also involve a minimum of 120 hours' work, and be oriented to the development of new working habits transferable to teachers' practice with their pupils.

Finally, there should be a minimum of 400 hours of guided individual work, with reading of books—not photocopies—and processing of information. Some of these hours should be spent in libraries or information rooms available in the institutions themselves.

The postgraduate programs should use a wide variety of teaching-learning strategies and resources. Exclusively lecture-based postgraduate courses for teachers are unacceptable, but so are those based exclusively on small-group work.

From the foregoing, we can conclude that a program of this type should have a minimum of 800 real hours' work on the part of the participant, which may be distributed in very different ways.

The postgraduate programs for teachers should be evaluated in progress by the participants and by an ad-hoc external body of representatives from the education system as well as by representatives of the users of the system and by the recipients of the graduates from the system and the programs. Some technical professional training establishments include the development of projects for resolving problems and dealing with needs evaluated by potential users. I know of the existence of this practice in upper secondary education, but unfortunately, I have not seen similar mechanisms for undergraduate or postgraduate teacher training.

Finally, it seems to be highly desirable for this type of program to include considered selection processes and follow-up of participants, for which there are many alternatives.

Before finishing, I want to come back to the idea that current problems in education have both exogenous and endogenous causes. We have been dealing with endogenous causes and we have to deal with them, but if society as a whole does not recognize the importance of education and is not convinced of the importance of educational institutions and of teachers, the funds to invest in education will not be available, teachers will not be able to make a real living, and all our efforts in teacher education and professional development will only have a fraction of its possible impact.

Notes

[1] I deliberately avoid using the term *postmodern*, which I keep for referring to a condition and not a historical period, in line with the meaning given to it by Lyotard (1998).

[2] I am not unaware of the literature that refers to teaching as a semiprofession, for example, the classic work of Etzioni (1963) and the contributions by authors such as Fernandez Enguita (1993, particularly Chapter 4). However, for the purposes of the argument I wish to present here, the distinction between profession and semiprofession is irrelevant, and Mintzberg's description clearly allows us to include teaching in the first category.

References

Apple, M. (1983). Curriculum form and the logic of technical control. In M.W. Apple & L. Weis (Eds.), *Ideology and practice in schooling*, p. 28. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Attali, J. (1996). School the day after tomorrow. *Prospects, 26*(3), 443-446.

Avalos, B. (2001). Mejoramiento de la formación inicial de profesores: Conjunción de políticas nacionales e iniciativas institucionales. In *Seminario Internacional "La formación de los formadores de jóvenes para el siglo XXI: Desafíos, experiencias y propuestas para su formación y capacitación,"* pp. 49-58. Maldonado, Uruguay: Ginebra, Suiza, Oficina Internacional de Educación.

Beck, U. (2000). *Un nuevo mundo feliz.* Madrid, Spain: Paidós.

Birgin, A. (1995). *Viejas y nuevas tensiones en el trabajo docente.* Buenos Aires, Argentina: FLACSO.

Diker, G., & Terigi, F. (1997). *La formación de maestros y profesores: Hoja de ruta.* Buenos Aires, Argentina: Paidós.

Dubet, F., & Martucelli, D. (2000). *A l'ecole. Sociologie de l'experience scolaire.* Paris, France: Editions du Seuil.

Etzione, A. (1963). *The semi professions and their organization: Teachers, nurses, social workers.* New York: Free Press.

Fernandez Enguita, M. 1993. *La profesión docente y la comunidad escolar: Crónica de un desencuentro.* Madrid, Spain: Morata.

Giddens, A. (1994). *Consecuencias de la modernidad.* Madrid, Spain: Alianza Universidad.

Goodson, I. (2000). The principled professional. *Prospects, 30*(2), 181-188.

Gvirtz, S. (1991). *Nuevas y viejas tendencias en la docencia.* Buenos Aires, Argentina: Centro Editor de América Latina.

Hargreaves, A. (1994). *Changing teachers, changing times: Teacher's work and culture in the postmodern age.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Hargreaves, A. (2000). Professionals and parents: Personal adversaries or public allies. *Prospects, 30*(2), 201-213.

Hargreaves, D. (1982). *The challenge for the comprehensive school: Culture, curriculum and community.* London, England: Routledge.

Lesourne, J. (1993). *Educación y sociedad: Los desafíos del año 2000.* Barcelona, Spain: Gedisa.

Litwin, E. (2001). Lineamientos nacionales para la formación del personal docente. In *Seminario Internacional "La formación de los formadores de jóvenes para el siglo XXI: desafíos, experiencias y propuestas para su formación y capacitación,"* pp. 24-35. Maldonado, Uruguay: Ginebra, Suiza, Oficina Internacional de Educación.

Lyotard, F. 1998. *La condicion postmoderna.* Buenos Aires, Argentina: REI.

Meirieu, P. (2000). *L'école des parents: La grande explication.* Paris, France: Plon.

Mintzberg, H. (1990). *La estructuración de las organizaciones.* Madrid, Spain: Ariel Economía.

Narodovski, M. (1994). *Infancia y poder: La conformación de la pedagogía moderna.* Buenos Aires, Argentina: Aique.

National Council for Teacher Education (India). (1998). *Policy perspectives in teacher education: Critique and documentation.* New Delhi, India: Author.

Nucinkis, N. (2001). La experiencia de contratación de universidades para poyar el proceso de formación del personal docente. In *Seminario Internacional "La formación de los formadores de jóvenes para el siglo XXI: Desafíos, experiencias y propuestas para su formación y capacitación,"* pp. 36-45. Maldonado, Uruguay: Ginebra, Suiza, Oficina Internacional de Educación.

Paqueay, L., Altet, M., Charlier, E., & Perrenoud, P. (Eds.). (2000). *Former les enseignants professionnels: Quelles stratégies? Quelles compétences?* Bruxelles, Belgium: DeBoeck Université.

Perelman, L. (1992). *School's out: Hyperlearning, the new technology, and the end of education.* New York: William Morrow.

Pérez Gómez, A. (1987). El pensamiento del profesor: Vínculo entre la teoría y la práctica. *Revista de educación, 284.*

Perrenoud, P. (1996). The teaching profession between proletarization and professionalization: Two models of change. *Prospects, 26*(3), 509-529.

Popkewitz, T., et al. (1992). La enseñanza y el rol del intelectual transformador. In A. Alliaud & L. Duschatzky, *Maestros: Formación, práctica y transformación escolar.* Buenos Aires, Argentina: Mio y D'Avila.

Pratz de Pérez, I. (1995). *Políticas de profesionalización del docente.* República Dominicana: PNUD.

Rifkin, J. (1996). *El fin del trabajo.* Buenos Aires, Argentina: Paidós.

Sacristan, J. G. (1997). *Docencia y cultura escolar.* Madrid, Spain: Lugar.

Schlechty, P. (1990). *Schools for the 21st century.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Tardif, M., & Lessard, C. (2000). *Le travail enseignant au quotidien: Expérience, interactions humaines et dilemmes professionnels.* Bruxelles, Belgium: DeBoeck Université.

Tedesco, J. C. (1995). *El nuevo pacto educativo: Educación, competitividad y ciudadanía en la sociedad moderna.* Madrid, Spain: Alauda Anaya.

Tyack, D., & Cuban, L. (1995). *Tinkering toward utopia: A century of public school reform.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

UNESCO/IBE. (2001, September). *Final report: Forty-sixth session of the International Conference on Education.* Geneva, Switzerland: Author.

United Nations Development Program. (2000). *Human development report 2000.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Also Available in AACTE's Lecture Series

Caring, Competent Teachers in Complex Classrooms
2001 Hunt Lecture
by Jacqueline Jordan Irvine, Emory University
Irvine discusses the cultural context of teaching and learning and its implications for preparing teachers.

Meeting the Challenge of High-Quality Teacher Education: Why Higher Education Must Change
2000 Hunt Lecture
by Arturo Pacheco, University of Texas at El Paso
Emphasizing the importance of collaboration, Pacheco outlines why and how teacher education programs, and the colleges and universities that house them, must change to improve teacher education.

Assessment and Teacher Education: Sharing the Bull's-Eye
1999 Hunt Lecture
by Nancy S. Cole, Educational Testing Service
Discusses the dilemmas shared by teacher education and assessment as "bull's-eyes" for those who are looking to place blame for U.S. educational problems.

Teaching and Teacher Education Among the Professions
1998 Hunt Lecture
by Lee S. Shulman, The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching
Discusses the standards of the teaching profession by highlighting six commonplaces of every profession as a framework to think and talk about teaching.

A Critical Appraisal of Teacher Education
1995 Hunt Lecture
by Seymour Sarason, Yale University
Challenges the teacher education community with a provocative view of the major problems in the U.S. education system.

Standards for Teachers
1994 Hunt Lecture
by Linda Darling-Hammond, Teachers College, Columbia University
Calls for standards for teachers both as a framework for practice and as an impetus for effective school reform.

Ready to Learn: A Mandate for the Nation
1993 Hunt Lecture
by Ernest Boyer, The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching
Discusses the serious responsibility to send all children to school "ready to learn."

AACTE
AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES FOR TEACHER EDUCATION

To order, contact
AACTE Publications
1307 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 300
Washington, DC 20005-4701
Tel: 202/293-2450
Fax: 202/457-8095
www.aacte.org

1307 New York Avenue, NW
Suite 300
Washington, DC 20005
www.aacte.org

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

NOTICE

REPRODUCTION BASIS

☑ This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket) form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.

☐ This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").